

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Demonstration Site: Los Angeles County	Reporting Period: Calendar Year 2013
<hr/>	
County Contact: Name: Jennifer Hottenroth Phone: (562) 345-6610 Email: hottje@dcfs.lacounty.gov	

Instructions: Pursuant to the legislative requirements for implementing RBS, each county participating in the RBS Demonstration Project shall prepare and submit an annual report. The report is to be developed in collaboration with the private nonprofit agency (ies) participating in the demonstration project. This County Annual Report (CAR) is to be prepared by the county as a single, comprehensive report for the reporting period. The report is prepared for each calendar year in which the RBS Reform Project is in operation and submitted by March 1 of the following year to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) at RBSreform@dss.ca.gov.

Section A - Client Outcomes:

- Complete the table below on the characteristics of the target population served in this reporting period.**

Total Number Of Youth:	Average Age Of Youth:	Number Of Youth Who Are:	Number Of Youth Who Are:	Number Of Youth Placed By:
142	12.5	Male: 121 Female: 21	African-American: 61 White: 26 Asian: 2 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1 American Indian/Alaskan native: 1 Hispanic: 51	Probation: NA Child Welfare: 142 Mental Health: NA Other: NA

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- 2. Complete and attach one excel document titled, “RBS Days of Care Schedule” for each RBS provider listing information for each youth enrolled in RBS since implementation of the project. This document captures information on the total days in care in residential, community-based bridge care, after-care and crisis stabilization, beginning with the youth’s initial enrollment in RBS.**
- a. For those youth who were both active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement, what percent exceeded the site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement and by an average of how many days?**

In 2013, 142 youth participated in the RBS program. Of those, 54 (38 %) youth met or exceeded the approved site target for average length residential stay of 10 months (305 days) averaging 117 days (3.8 Months).

- b. For those youth who exited (for any reason) from the RBS program during the reporting period, what percent exceeded the approved site target for average length of stay in the full RBS program (residential plus community) and by an average of how many days?**

In 2013, the target average length of stay in the full RBS program (residential plus community) was 24 months. 67 (42%), of the 142 youth that exited the program 13 (10%) of them had an average length of stay in the full RBS program by an average of 825 days. The average over the 730 days was 95 days equal to approximately 3 months beyond the target.

(Note: As of the writing of this report, 4 additional youth remain active in the RBS program with 3 in the community and 1 in the residential portion of the program with an average of 138.2 days over the 24 month target length of stay).

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- c. What number and percent of youth stepped down from group home residential placement to a lower level of care during the reporting period? Of those youth who stepped down, what number and percent returned to group home residential care? For any youth who stepped down to a lower level of care and returned to group home residential care multiple times, describe the number of youth and the reasons for each movement up and down in level of care.**

45 (32%) of the youth who were enrolled in RBS during 2013, stepped down to a lower level of care in 2013.

10 (22%) of the 45 youth that stepped down to a lower level of care returned to group home residential care after being in a lower level of care.

The agencies reported the reasons youth that stepped down to a lower level of care and returned to group home residential care multiple times is the following:

- Potential adoptive family changed their mind
- Child and Family Services removed the second youth from home and returned him to Residential Placement due to safety reasons
- Parents felt that they were not ready to keep the youth safe in the community even with team support.
- One youth exited the program into another Residential treatment program shortly after returning to Residential group home care.
- A youth is still in the Residential program.
- The youth stepped down to a lower level of care again and into a Foster home where he is still active in the RBS program.
- Two youth returned to residential placement due to behaviors exceeding the willingness and/or ability of the caregiver to manage.
- Two youth's behavior destabilized requiring more support than community care can provide

- d. Of those youth active in RBS during the reporting period, what number and percent exited from RBS due to graduation, emancipation, voluntary closure, and other (as defined by "Current Status Code" in the RBS Days of Care Schedule)? Of those exiting as "other", describe the reasons for disenrollment.**

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

The following table shows a total of 142 youth that were active during the reporting period and those that exited RBS (numbers 4-8).

1 RBS case open with youth in Residential group care	49	35%
2 RBS case open with youth in bridge care	5	4%
3 RBS case open with youth in PP and RBS aftercare	22	15%
Subtotal	76	
4 closed Graduation	34	24%
5 Closed before Grad due to Emancipation	0	0%
6 Closed before grad reason other than emancipation	32	23%
7 Closed, voluntary	0	0%
8 Closed AB 3632 eligible ends	0	0%
Subtotal	66	
Total	142	

The reasons for disenrollment include but are not limited to the following:

- Youth exceeded 10 month mark and there was no discharge plan
- Youth was placed in a six bed group home due to requiring that level of care but needing a smaller environment
- Youth was placed in an ITFC home but it disrupted due to caregiver being unable to manage his behaviors. He was placed in a six bed group home
- Youth were placed in a level 14 placement due to needing a higher level of care.
- youth went into lower level group home
- Youth went to a same level residential treatment program
- Youth went to a higher level residential treatment program
- Youth ran away
- Youth went into a Juvenile Justice program
- Youth went to lower level placement with relatives out of County

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- e. Of those youth who exited from RBS since implementation of the RBS program, what number and percent re-enrolled in RBS during this reporting period?**

There are 5 youth that exited RBS completely and returned to RBS residential within a month.

There were an unknown amount of children that had been requested to return to RBS that were not able to return for various reasons including, no open beds or program related issues.

- f. What percent of youth utilized crisis stabilization services during the reporting period? Of those youth, what was the average number of episodes of crisis stabilization per youth? List the reasons why the crisis stabilization episode occurred:**

34 of 142 or 24% youth utilized crisis stabilization during this reporting period. The following represents the number of youth with the amount of crisis stabilization episodes:

- 19 youth had 1 episode
- 8 youth had 2 episodes
- 4 youth had 3 episodes
- 1 youth had 5 episodes
- 1 youth had 8 episodes
- 1 youth had 11 episodes

The average number of crisis stabilization episodes was 1.7 episodes, with 1 episode being the mode.

The agencies indicated that the reasons crisis stabilization was utilized include the following:

- Major act of aggression and caregiver felt uncomfortable to maintain client in the home.
- Placement was terminated but client did not have another placement.
- Challenges being compliant, and engaging in risky behavior including: defiance in the home, threatening family, destroying property, fighting in school and with caregivers, drug use, and leaving home without permission.
- Unsafe behavior in the home or community
- Used as a respite bed while a foster parent went on vacation or as a temporary placement

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Section B - Client Involvement:

1. **Using the Child and Adolescence Needs and Strengths (CANS) data provided by Walter R. McDonald and Associates, Inc. (WRMA), address the following:**

- a. **Describe any trends indicated by the CANS data.**

Due to WRMA no longer providing information, the following response is based on two of the agency's information and the third agency did not contribute to the information in this section.

The agencies consistently found that there was significant improvement in the Child Safety domain. There was opposing data between agencies as to substance abuse/substance use complications. One agency indicated that there was a negative improvement in crime and delinquency. There was a decrease of need from intake to discharge in several domains but it is undetermined if it is statistically relevant.

- b. **Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

The overall data obtained from the agencies was not consistent but there seems to be consistency regarding child safety showing improvement. There was also improvement in the need for mental health support in that there was a decreased need from intake to discharge. Other noted improvements were not consistent agency to agency but included building children's strengths and improving family functioning.

2. a. **Complete the table below on family and youth participation in child/family team meetings during the reporting period.**

Total Number Of Youth:	Total Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult During Any Part Of The Reporting Period:	Number Of Youth Participating In At Least 90% Of Their Child/Family Team Meetings:	Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult Participating In At Least 90% Of That Youth's Child/Family Team Meetings:
142	120	121	90

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

b. If youth did not participate, explain why not.

There are times when a youth may not attend a meeting due to various reasons including but not limited to:

- The meeting creates emotional distress that has a negative impact on the child.
- The child refuses to attend for various reasons including they do not agree with the plan, there is no formal plan in place or the plan is not moving quickly enough to meet the child's expectations.
- Some discussion topics in the meeting may not be suitable or appropriate for some children.
- Conflicts in scheduling with other commitments.

Section C - Client Satisfaction:

1. Using the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS) and Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F) data provided by WRMA, specifically satisfaction measured in Items 1-15 of the YSS and YSS-F and outcomes measured in Items 16-22 of the YSS and YSS-F, address the following:

a. Describe any trends in the data.

WRMA has not provided data evaluation during this report year. However the agencies have provided the following information:

Overall the agencies data indicated that a substantial number of parents and youth were satisfied with the services they were provided. In one agency this was specifically significant as to their involvement with planning, treatment and voice and choice. The youth reported significance with improved well being. Overall parents tended to score higher satisfaction than the youth.

When dissatisfaction was noted it was due to not being able to choose some of their treatment services. This may be due to the referring agencies and the courts needing specific matters addressed in treatment. Another area of dissatisfaction was due to not being able to choose their treatment teams.

b. Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?

Yes, Overall families are satisfied with RBS services, the families felt involved and supported through the process.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Section D - County and Provider Use of RBS Program:

1. a. **During the reporting period, has the operation of the program significantly changed from the original design described in the approved plan? If yes, describe the change.**

Yes. LA County DCFS implemented a new policy requiring additional screening processes aiming to reduce group home placements of children 12 years old and younger. This policy has had an impact on intake referrals for all of the agencies.

- b. **If yes, how has this adaptation impacted the effectiveness of the project?**

The new policy has negatively impacted the agencies ability to maintain their enrollment capacity. Although the policy may be the result of fewer referrals to the agencies the effectiveness of the program does not appear to be affected at this time.

2. **During the reporting period, have there been any significant differences from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the various county agencies and provider(s)? If yes, describe the differences.**

Roles and responsibilities have not changed for the agency providers. However, at least one agency reports some role confusion which they have tried to address. The DCFS Annual Technical Reviews found that some agencies are having their residential staff work partially in an RBS role and partially in a cottage staff or other role. This is not part of the approved plan and may cause role confusion as well as interfere with the amount of impact and progress of the team on the family and especially the youth.

3. **Were RBS enrollments sufficient during the reporting period? If not, why not?**

No, the enrollments were not sufficient during this reporting period. The new DCFS policy requiring additional screening processes aiming to reduce group home placements of children 12 years old and younger. This policy has had an impact on intake referrals for all of the agencies.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- 4. Describe how the county and provider(s) managed RBS staff resources during the reporting period (e.g., filling vacancies, redefining job qualifications, eliminating positions, etc.)**

The three agencies have been impacted differently in this area. During this reporting period the drop in enrollments and loss of revenue has impacted staff resources in one agency and the staff needed to be reduced and/or roles redefined. Another agency maintained the staff based on the MOU and SOW or added staff to increase or improve the family search and engagement processes to train the parent partners. The final agency reports no major challenges with staff and has found that the staff have been more consistent and have developed an RBS culture. They also found that turnover of staff has been in the normal range and that cottage staff generally has the most turnover and find that to be a common challenge of residential care.

Section E - County Payments to Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The payments reported here are from the county records as recorded on a cash basis during the reporting period from January 1 to December 31, for all providers participating in the RBS demonstration project.

- 1. For Questions a through c, please complete the table below:**
- a. Report the total payments from all fund sources paid to the provider(s) for RBS during the period the report covers under each of the following:**
 - **Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC).**
(The amounts reported here should come from the amount reported under H1, amount claimed per fiscal tracking sheet. They will not be equal because H1 is cumulative for the project and F1 is only for the reporting year.)
 - **Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT).**
 - **Mental Health Services Act (MHSA).**
 - **Grants, loans, other. (Itemize any amounts reported by source.)**
 - b. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Group Care for all children/youth enrolled in group home care during the reporting period.**
 - c. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Community Care for all children/youth enrolled in community services (not in group home) during the reporting period.**

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

	AFDC-FC	EPSDT	MHSA	Other	Total
Amount Paid for Residential	\$5,807,672.00	\$2,204,259.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,011,931.47
Amount Paid for Community	\$1,472,815.00	\$1,386,243.37	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,859,058.37
Total Amount Paid	\$7,280,487.00	\$3,590,502.84	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,870,989.84
Average Length of Stay in Residential	5.2 months	-	-	-	5.2 months
Average Length of Stay in Community	4.4 months	-	-	-	4.4 months
Average AFDC-FC Payment Per Youth in Residential	\$51,854.00	\$19,680.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$71,534.00
Average AFDC-FC Payment per Youth in Community	\$19,379.00	\$18,240.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$37,619.00

- 2. Were any changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfalls/overages, incentives, refunds during the reporting period? If yes, explain what the changes were and why they were needed.**

On December 2, 2012 a rate increase of \$714.00 per month per youth was approved by the Board of Supervisors to help compensate for fiscal shortfalls as reported by the agencies.

In addition on December 2013 the ten month rate reduction was eliminated which allows for the agencies to receive the higher rate throughout the RBS residential portion of the program. It is premature to identify the impact of the 2013 rate change but it is anticipated that there will be an agency identified impact in 2014.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section F - Actual Costs of Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The amounts reported here should be based on each provider's accounting records for RBS for the period from January 1 through December 31, and be on a basis consistent with the method used to report costs on the annual A-133 Financial Audit Report and SR3 document filed with CDSS.

1. a. **For residential costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.**

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

Actual Costs in RBS Residential:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$1,868,578.00	\$2,044,393.00	\$175,815.00
Total Operating Costs	\$1,035,303.00	\$1,027,965.00	(\$7,338.00)
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$1,565,134.00	\$1,703,377.00	\$138,243.00
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$3,071,551.00	\$2,672,384.00	(\$399,167.00)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$485,734.00	\$314,282.00	(\$171,452.00)
Total Indirect Costs	\$759,093.00	\$790,141.00	\$31,048.00
Total Expenditures	\$8,785,393.00	\$8,552,542.00	(\$232,851.00)

- b. **Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.**

The agencies provided varying information regarding their costs and budget. One agency indicated that salaries increased in child care and in social work and support costs and that the difference is expected to be permanent. Another agency indicated that youth who graduated sooner than expected and fewer youth entering the program resulted in a reduction of clients being serviced by their RBS program which reduced revenues to the program. The last agency indicated that the budget was based on the assumption clients would reside

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

in RBS Residential for 9-months or less. However many clients, approximately 37% remained well beyond the 9 months. The rate for these youth dropped at the end of 10 months, resulting in a negative impact on the budget. It is believed this problem will be temporary due to the removal of the 10 month rate drop.

2. a. For community costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

Actual Costs in RBS Community:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$714,125.00	\$710,883.00	(\$3,242.00)
Total Operating Costs	\$984,230.00	\$228,513.00	(\$755,717.00)
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$196,574.00	\$196,046.00	(\$528.00)
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$1,576,405.00	\$1,012,107.00	(\$564,298.00)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$2,469,754.00	\$348,555.00	(\$2,121,199.00)
Total Indirect Costs	\$478,127.00	\$357,423.00	(\$120,704.00)
Total Expenditures	\$4,607,144.00	\$2,607,434.00	(\$1,999,710.00)

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.

☒ Yes ☐ No Explain: The agencies reported the following regarding their budget:

- Expenses were cumulatively under by 15 percent due to a lower actual census in the community.
- Client referrals are below budgeted census - this also impacts the number in the community.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

- Our client base is much older making it more difficult to successfully place the client in the Community – lack of bridge care options (FFA/ITFC) have made it difficult to move youth safely to the community.
- Several clients have been disenrolled – all with county concurrence.
- Maintaining the right staffing levels and administration of the program is made more difficult by the above listed items – we are still learning the right mix of staff needed to appropriately serve the youth.
- Anticipated fewer clients transitioning into the community.

3. Were there extraordinary costs associated with any particular child/youth (i.e., outliers as defined in the Funding Model)? If yes, provide the amount of the cost and describe what it purchased.

The agencies have experienced a number of youth who were ready to move to the community but no placement had been identified for the youth. This dilemma resulted in youth remaining in a group home setting with RBS for 1-13+ months more than needed. Given the rate for care dropped after 10 months for each of the youth this problem became very costly the agencies. This problem seems to be resolved in the current contract year, in that there is an approved amendment to the funding that allows the agencies to receive the full rate for the entire time the children are in residential care.

4. Has the county performed the fiscal audit required by the memorandum of understanding? If yes, describe any problems/issues with the provider's operations or implementation of the Funding Model that were disclosed by the fiscal audit performed. If no, when will that audit occur?

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain: The audits for 2013 have not been completed yet. We do not anticipate receipt of the completed audits from the Auditor-Controller until the end of 2014 or the beginning of 2015.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section G - Impact on AFDC-FC Costs:

1. This is a cumulative report from the beginning of the project. Amounts reported are based on the amounts included in the claim presented to CDSS. Using the RBS claim fiscal tracking sheets, please complete the information below for all children served by RBS from the start of the project to the end of the reporting period:

RBS Payments for All Children Enrolled in RBS from the start of the project through the end of the Reporting Period:

Total Children Served In RBS: <u>214</u>	Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$10,479,250.00	\$ 3,760,178.00	\$1,616,894.00	\$ 5,102,178.00
Community:	\$2,159,736.00	\$231,786.00	\$744,895.00	\$1,183,055.00
Total Federal Payments:	\$12,638,986			
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$6,561,388.00	\$0.00	\$2,038,735.00	\$4,522,653.00
Community:	\$1,365,737.00	\$0.00	\$518,495.00	\$847,242.00
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$7,927,125.00			
Total RBS Payments	\$20,566,111.00			

Note: It is possible to have federal funds used in the Non-federal Payment (i.e., non-federal RBS children) category. These payments would be the federal share of any Emergency Assistance Funding used in the RBS program up to the first 12 months of a child's stay in RBS. The amounts reported would come from the non-federal fiscal tracking sheet, and are based on the instructions provided in RBS Letter No. 03-11, dated June 21, 2011.

2. Of the children reported in G1 above, please complete the information below for all children who successfully entered and exited RBS in 24 months, or remained in RBS for a full 24 months.

Note: When completing G2, it is important to understand how G2, G3, and G4 work to form the comparison to regular AFDC-FC costs. Section G4 is a comparison of cost for those children who have completed RBS (from G2) to the cost of regular foster care based on the target group base period (G3). In this context, a child "completing RBS" is

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

one who has either entered the program and then exited after successfully completing his/her RBS program goal, or one who has entered the program and remained in the program longer than the base period (24 months). The comparison in Section G4 is done only for those children who have successfully completed the RBS program goal or are still in the program at the 24 month mark. The count of children for Section G2 and the related costs are only for those children who have completed the RBS program or remained in RBS longer than 24 months. For example, a child entering RBS who remains in the program for only 3 months and then is disenrolled would not be included in G2. A child entering RBS and still in the program at month 26 would be included in G2.

RBS Payments for all Children Entering and Exiting RBS in the 24 month Period or remaining in the program for longer than 24 months. (Include all children meeting this condition from the beginning of the project.):

Total Children Completing RBS: _____ 87 _____

Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
--------	----------	--------	---------

Federal Payments:

Residential:

\$4,746,097.00	\$1,898,392.00	\$759,357.00	\$2,088,348.00
-----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

Community:

\$1,717,346.00	\$858,673.00	\$343,469.00	\$515,204.00
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Total Federal Payments:

\$6,463,443.00

Non-federal Payments:

Residential:

\$3,069,674.00	\$0.00	\$982,272.00	\$2,087,402.00
-----------------------	---------------	---------------------	-----------------------

Community:

\$1,097,849.00	\$0.00	\$439,140.00	\$658,709.00
-----------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------------

Total Non-federal Payments:

\$4,167,523.00

Total RBS Payments:

\$10,630,966.00	\$2,757,065.00	\$2,524,238.00	\$5,349,663.00
------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

- 3. Using the approved Attachment A from the Funding Model and the number of children reported in G2 (above), complete the information below regarding the expected base Foster Care costs for RBS target population children that otherwise would have been served in Foster Care.**

Note: Since Section G3 of the CAR is used to compare the base AFDC-FC rates had the RBS youth remained in regular foster care, the "Approved Base Rate Per Child" is the weighted average of AFDC-FC payments for Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 and RCL 14 placements as described and approved in the Funding Model. The "Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care" section is the approved comparison length for the RBS youth had they remained in regular foster care. For all RBS counties, the approved base months in regular foster care is 24 months, based on the demographic for the current length of stay in a group home for the target group. The "Applicable Federal

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Funds Rate” is the percentage of federal funds rate based on the federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP) used in the RBS claim. The CAR template has this FMAP funding rate pre-loaded at 50 percent because all of the RBS Funding Models used the pre-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) FMAP rate of 50 percent for approval purposes. However, because Section G1 of the CAR instructs counties to use financial costs based on the RBS Fiscal Tracking sheets, counties must use the ARRA rate in effect for that month and quarter. For the months through and including December 2010, the ARRA rate is 56.2 percent. For the months beginning January 2011, the ARRA rate will decline until it reaches 50 percent beginning July 2011. Details on the ARRA rates used in the RBS claim are in an RBS claim letter. In order to produce a correct comparison of costs between sections G1, G2, and G3, whatever federal funds rate is used in Section G1 should be the same rate used for G2 and G3.

Note: If zero have completed, enter zero for this reporting period comparison.

AFDC-FC Base for Comparison:

Approved Base Rate Per Child:	\$6,138.00	(from H2, above)
Number of Children Completing RBS:	87	
Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care:	24	
Applicable Federal Funds Rate:	50%	

	Total	Federal	State	County
Base Payment for Target Group:	\$12,818,144	\$6,408,072	\$2,563,228.80	\$3,844,843.20

4. For those children who have completed the RBS program, using the information from G2 and G3 above, subtract G3 from G2 and complete the following information:

	Total	Federal	State	County
RBS Incremental Cost/(Savings)Based On Program Completion:	(\$2,185,178.00)	(\$3,651,007.00)	(\$38,991.00)	(\$1,504,820.00)

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

b. What aspects of operating RBS contributed to the cost/savings compared to regular Foster Care?

RBS provides more individualized services than foster care which helps to reduce replacements and increase stabilization, safety, well being and permanency. Some of the services include but are not limited to:

- Wraparound services
- Crisis Bed availability and usage helped preserve placement and provide respite
- On going support and services from residential to community
- Family Finding
- 24 hour awake residential staff
- Family support from residential through community

5. Has EPSDT usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.

☐ Yes ☐ No Explain: The data regarding youth in traditional foster care is unknown thus we are unable to make such a comparison at this time.

6. Has MHSA usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.

☐ Yes ☐ No Explain:
Not Applicable

Section H - Lessons Learned:

1. Describe the most significant program lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

Some of the lessons learned include:

- Use crisis beds for true crisis, not as an interim placement until another placement is found.
- Do not graduate a case too soon after transition into the community as families need support for longer than a couple months which could be a honeymoon period.
- Increase resources for bridge care especially for youth that may not have a permanency option but don't require the intensive support of GH placement
- Few community placements and placement options delay progress for the youth when youth are ready to transition out of residential care

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

- There seems to be a direct correlation between CSW involvement with RBS cases and successful RBS outcomes. It is especially significant when the CSW believes in the RBS process and is involved in the CFT meetings.
- Transforming residential care to the RBS model is an ongoing challenge
- Teaming and communication with over burdened LA County Social Workers has been an ongoing challenge.
- Determining the best eligibility criteria for RBS youth and who are best served by the RBS model has been challenging in that the youth have shifting needs regarding community placement, the contract is vague and the need for services for very high risk youth remains.
- Several community placements have been supported and maintained through the use of Mobile Crisis support and Crisis stabilization beds.

2. Describe the most significant fiscal lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

The most significant fiscal lessons learned and best practices applied during this reporting period include but are not limited to:

- Budget more for youth specialists on call due to assigned staff unavailability.
- Increase budget for holiday time and a half pay scale.
- Less reliance on a stable census of youth in the program at any given time.
- Prepare better for low enrollments and youth remaining in residential beyond the 10 month expectation.
- Prepare better for DCFS lengthy processes including referral and ASFA processing.
- Youth remaining over the 10 months in residential
- inadequate resources for placement
- sometimes lack of support from County representatives
- The community phase placement deductions are taken out of the \$4,184.00 Community phase rate. However there seems to be a larger percentage of placement rate deductions in RBS versus our regular Wraparound program which suggests that RBS youth are often stepping down from residential care into placements that are more expensive. I.e. specialized foster care.